arXiv:0909.2011v3 [math.DG] 11 Sep 2010

Generalized pseudo-Kähler structures and pseudo-bihermitian surfaces

Johann Davidov[*], Gueo Grantcharov, Oleg Mushkarov[†], Miroslav Yotov

Abstract

In this paper we consider pseudo-bihermitian structures – pairs of complex structures compatible with pseudo-Riemannian metrics. We establish relations of these structures with generalized (pseudo-) Kähler geometry and holomorphic Poisson structures similar to that in the positive definite case. We provide a list of compact complex surfaces which could admit pseudo-bihermitian structures and give examples of such structures on some of them. We also consider a naturally defined null plane distribution on a generalized pseudo-Kähler 4-manifold and show that under a mild restriction it determines an Engel structure.

1 Introduction

Bihermitian structures have recently received a serious attention due to their relations to supersymmetric sigma models in theoretical physics and generalized geometry. However one of the reasons they were introduced in [3] was the observation that the self-dual component of the Weyl tensor of an oriented Riemannian 4-manifold determines a restriction on the number of (local) complex structures compatible with the metric and the orientation. The possibilities are 0, 1, 2, or ∞, if we consider as one the

---

[*] Partially supported by "L.Karavelov" Civil Engineering Higher School, Sofia, Bulgaria under contract No 10/2009

[†] Partially supported by CNRS-BAS joint research project *Invariant metrics and complex geometry, 2008-2009*

structures differing by sign. The bihermitian structures thus arise naturally on 4-manifolds with 2 different (up to sign) compatible complex structures. About 15 years earlier than the paper [3], these structures appeared in the physics literature [12], where the target spaces of the sigma-models with $(2,2)$-sypersymmetry were identified with Riemannian manifolds with 2 compatible complex structures satisfying additional differential restrictions. An impulse for development of this topic in geometry and string theory was the interpretation of bihermitian structures in terms of the so-called generalized Kähler structures [19, 16], the latter being equivalent to the $(2,2)$-supersymmetric sigma models in [12]. This interpretation brought an important new viewpoint for studying deformations of such structures and led to a number of new examples [17, 14].

On a pseudo-Riemannian 4-manifold of neutral signature $(+,+,-,-)$ there are analogs for most of the notions in the Riemannian case. In particular, one can consider compatible complex structures and there is a good notion of self-duality, unlike in the Lorentzian case. Many results in the neutral setting are similar to results in the Riemannian case but there are also important differences. In this note we develop the notion of a pseudo-bihermitian structure which was considered also in the physics literature, see [13]. We show that, in the same way as in the Riemannian case, it can be related to (twisted) generalized pseudo-Kähler structures (Section 3) as well as to holomorphic Poisson structures (Section 4). As a byproduct of Example 1 in Section 4 we also obtain that any holomorphic line bundle on the 3-dimensional complex flag manifold is a holomorphic Poisson module with respect to a Poisson structure of a special type. In Section 5 we provide a list of all compact complex surfaces which might carry pseudo-bihermitian structures. It contains the list of bihermitian surfaces obtained in [3] and the examples given in Proposition 6 are "complementary" to the bihermitian ones. While any Kodaira surface does not admit generalized Kähler structures [4, 5], it admits a generalized pseudo-Kähler structure, as it is shown in Section 5 by means of a construction in [20, 16]. We consider also some other differences between the Riemannian and the neutral setting. The first one is related to the basic observation that on a 4-dimensional vector space two complex structures J_+ and J_- with the same orientation are compatible with a positive-definite inner product iff $J_+J_- + J_-J_+ = 2pId$ for a constant p with $|p| < 1$. The same holds for structures compatible with a split-signature inner product, but this time $|p| > 1$. The difference appears when the above identity is considered globally on a 4-manifold.

If p is a function with $|p| < 1$ at each point, then there always exists a unique conformal class of positive-definite metrics compatible with J_+ and J_-. However we show in Section 5 that there are compact 4-manifolds admitting two such structures J_+ and J_- with $|p| > 1$ at every point which are not compatible with a global pseudo-Riemannian metric, despite the fact that locally such a metric always exists. Another difference comes from the fact that there is a naturally defined null-plane distribution on any pseudo-bihermitian manifold, which is totally real with respect to both complex structures. We show in Section 6 that under a mild restriction this distribution is an Engel structure, which is a good analog of a contact structure in dimension four [28].

Acknowledgements: The authors express their gratitude to V.Apostolov for the helpful discussions and comments on a preliminary version of this paper. Part of this work was done during the visit of the first and the third-named authors at the Abdus Salam School of Mathematical Sciences, GC University Lahore, Pakistan and the second named author's visit to the Institute of Mathematics and Informatics at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. The authors thank the two institutions for their hospitality.

2 Preliminaries

An almost para-hypercomplex structure on a smooth 4-manifold M (also called an almost complex product[1] or a neutral almost hypercomplex structure [11]) consists of three endomorphisms J_1, J_2, J_3 of TM satisfying the relations

$$J_1^2 = -J_2^2 = -J_3^2 = -Id, \quad J_1J_2 = -J_2J_1 = J_3 \tag{1}$$

of the imaginary units of the paraquaternionic algebra (split quaternions). A metric g on M is called compatible with the structure $\{J_1, J_2, J_3\}$ if

$$g(J_1X, J_1Y) = -g(J_2X, J_2Y) = -g(J_3X, J_3Y) = g(X, Y) \tag{2}$$

(such a metric is necessarily of neutral signature $(+,+,-,-)$). In this case we say that $\{g, J_1, J_2, J_3\}$ is an almost para-hyperhermitian structure. For any such a structure we define three 2-forms Ω_i setting $\Omega_i(X, Y) = g(J_iX, Y)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. If the Nijenhuis tensors of J_1, J_2, J_3 vanish, the structure $\{g, J_1, J_2, J_3\}$ is called para-hyperhermitian. When additionally the

2-forms $\Omega_i(X,Y) = g(J_iX,Y)$ are closed, the para-hyperhermitian structure is called para-hyperkähler (also called hypersymplectic [18] and neutral hyperkähler [11]).

Hypercomplex or para-hypercomplex structures can be obtained in the following way. Consider a 4-manifold with two complex structures J_+ and J_- such that

$$J_+J_- + J_-J_+ = 2pId \tag{3}$$

for a function p.

Suppose that $|p| < 1$ at each point. Then J_+, $K = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-p^2}}[J_+, J_-]$, $S = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-p^2}}(J_- + pJ_+)$ form an almost hypercomplex structure (cf. e.g.[13]). Thus the complex structures J_+ and J_- are compatible with a positive definite metric.

If $|p| > 1$ at every point, then

$$J_+,\ K = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{p^2-1}}[J_+, J_-],\ S = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{p^2-1}}(J_- + pJ_+)$$

form an almost para-hypercomplex structure [13]. Hence by [9] there is a locally defined metric compatible with the structure $\{J_+, K, S\}$. It is clear that the structure J_- is also compatible with this metric. Conversely, if the structures J_+ and J_- are compatible with a pseudo-Riemannian metric g, so will be K and S, hence g is of neutral signature. Note that, unlike the positive definite case, given J_+ and J_-, such a metric may not exist globally (see Example 3 in Section 5).

It follows from the above discussion that if $|p| \neq 1$ at every point, then J_+ and J_- yield the same orientation. This is a consequence from the well-known fact that two non-collinear (almost) complex structures on a 4-manifold both compatible with a pseudo-Riemannian metric determine opposite orientations exactly when they commute.

If $J_+ \neq \pm J_-$ are complex structures on a 4-manifold compatible with a pseudo-Riemannian metric g and if they yield the same orientation, then (g, J_+, J_-) is said to be a *pseudo-bihermitian structure*. Such a structure is called *strict* if $J_+ \neq \pm J_-$ at every point.

Note that if (g, J_+, J_-) is a pseudo-bihermitian structure, then J_+ and J_- satisfy identity (3) with $p = -\frac{1}{2}g(J_+, J_-)$.

The following lemma is well-known in the positive definite case. For the neutral case it is stated in [13] and proved in [24] for generalized Kähler structures. For the sake of completeness we provide a new proof, which works both in the positive and neutral-signature cases.

Lemma 1 *Let J_+ and J_- be complex structures on a 4-manifold such that $J_+J_- + J_-J_+ = 2pId$ for $p = const$ and $|p| > 1$. Then $\{J_+, K, S\}$ is a para-hypercomplex structure.*

Proof: We have to prove that the almost product structures K and S are integrable. To do this we shall use a local neutral metric g compatible with the structure $\{J_+, K, S\}$. Then J_- is also compatible with g and $p = -\frac{1}{2}g(J_+, J_-)$. Denote by $F^{\pm}$ the Kähler 2-form of $(g, J_{\pm})$. Then a standard formula for the Hermitian structure $(g, J_{\pm})$ gives:

$$\begin{gathered} g((\nabla_X J_{\pm})(Y), Z) = (\nabla_X F^{\pm})(Y, Z) = \\ \frac{1}{2}(dF^{\pm}(J_{\pm}X, Y, J_{\pm}Z) + dF^{\pm}(J_{\pm}X, J_{\pm}Y, Z)), \end{gathered} \tag{4}$$

where ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of g.

Since the dimension of the manifold is four, there is a unique 1-form $\theta_{\pm}$ (the Lee form) such that $dF^{\pm} = \theta_{\pm} \wedge F^{\pm}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} g((\nabla_X J_{\pm})(Y), Z) &= g(X, Z)\theta_{\pm}(J_{\pm}Y) - g(J_{\pm}X, Z)\theta_{\pm}(Y) \\ &\quad -g(X, Y)\theta_{\pm}(J_{\pm}Z) - g(J_{\pm}X, Y)\theta_{\pm}(Z) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2X(g(J_+, J_-)) &= 2g(\nabla_X J_+, J_-) + 2g(J_+, \nabla_X J_-) = \\ &\quad -\theta_+([J_+, J_-]X) + \theta_-([J_+, J_-]X) \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$2d(g(J_+, J_-)) = -(\theta_+ - \theta_-) \circ [J_+, J_-] \tag{5}$$

In view of the identity $2p = -g(J_+, J_-)$, the condition $p = const$ leads to $\theta_+ = \theta_-$ since $[J_+, J_-] = 2\sqrt{p^2 - 1}K \neq 0$ at every point. Then using the identity $S = -\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{p^2 - 1}}(J_- + pJ_+)$ we see that the fundamental 2-form F^S of S is a linear combination of F^- and F^+ with constant coefficients. Hence $dF^S = \theta_+ \wedge F^S$, so the Lee form of (g, S) is θ_+. Let F^K be the fundamental 2-form of (g, K) and denote its Lee form by θ^K. Take a g-orthogonal basis of tangent vectors $\{E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4\}$ with $||E_1||^2 = ||E_2||^2 =$

1, $||E_3||^2 = ||E_4||^2 = -1$. Set $\varepsilon_i = ||E_i||^2$, $i = 1,2,3,4$. Then the identities $dF^K = \theta^K \wedge F^K$ and

$$\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon_i dF^K(E_i, KE_i, Z) = 2\sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon_i g((\nabla_{E_i} K)(KE_i), Z).$$

give

$$\theta^K(Z) = -\sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon_i [g((\nabla_{E_i} K)(E_i), KZ).$$

for any tangent vector Z. Since $K = -J_+ S$, we have

$$\theta^K(Z) = -\sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon_i [g((\nabla_{E_i} J_+)(SE_i), J_+ SZ) - \sum_{i=1}^4 \varepsilon_i [g((\nabla_{E_i} S)(E_i), SZ).$$

Using (4) and the fact that $dF^+ = \theta_+ \wedge F^+$ one can easily see that the first term on the right-hand side vanishes. The second term is $\theta^S(Z)$. Thus $\theta^K = \theta^S = \theta_+$, therefore the structures K and S are integrable, see [23]. *q.e.d.*

3 Generalized pseudo-Kähler structures

Recall that a H-twisted generalized complex structure on a smooth manifold M is an endomorphism I of the bundle $TM \oplus T^*M$ satisfying the following conditions:

(a) $I^2 = -Id$,

(b) I preserves the natural metric

$< X + \xi, Y + \eta >= \frac{1}{2}(\xi(Y) + \eta(X)), \quad X, Y \in TM, \quad \xi, \eta \in T^*M$

(c) the $+i$-eigensubbundle of I in $(TM \oplus T^*M) \otimes \mathbb{C}$ is involutive with respect to the H-twisted Courant bracket defined by

$$[X + \xi, Y + \eta]_H = [X, Y] + L_X\eta - L_Y\xi - \frac{1}{2}(d\imath_X\eta - d\imath_Y\xi) + \imath_Y\imath_X H,$$

where H is a closed 3-form.

The integrability condition (c) is equivalent to vanishing of the Nijenhuis tensor

$$N_H(A, B) = [A, B]_H - [IA, IB]_H + I[IA, B]_H + I[A, IB]_H, \; A, B \in TM \oplus T^*M.$$

The space of 2-forms $\Omega^2(M)$ acts on $TM \oplus T^*M$ as $e^b(X+\xi) = X+\xi+i_Xb$ for any $b \in \Omega^2(M)$. Then the Courant bracket satisfies $[e^b(A), e^b(B)]_H = [A,B]_{H+db}$. In particular if I is a generalized complex structure, integrable with respect to the H-twisted Courant bracket, then $J = e^{-b}Ie^b$ is a generalized complex structure, integrable with respect to the $(H-db)$-twisted Courant bracket. So whenever H is exact, $H = db$ for some 2-from b, the structure I is called untwisted since the structure J is integrable with respect to the Courant bracket with vanishing 3-form.

Following M.Gualtieri [16] we introduce the following:

Definition 1 *A (twisted) generalized pseudo-Kähler structure is a pair of commuting (twisted) generalized complex structures* $I_1, I_2 : T\oplus T^* \to T\oplus T^*$, *such that the* ± 1*-eigenspaces* $L^\pm$ *of* $G = I_1I_2$ *are transversal to* T *and the canonical inner product on* $T \oplus T^*$ *is non-degenerate on* $L^\pm$.

Using the same proof as in [16], we have

Theorem 2 *A* H*-twisted generalized pseudo-Kähler structure on a manifold* M *is equivalent to a quadruple* (g, J_+, J_-, b), *where* g *is a pseudo-Riemannian metric,* J_+ *and* J_- *are* g*-hermitian complex structures, and* b *is a 2-form such that* $d^+F^+ = -d^-F^- = H + db$, *where* $F^\pm$ *is the Kähler form of* $(g, J_\pm)$ *and* $d^\pm$ *is the imaginary part of the* $\overline{\partial}$*-operator for* $J_\pm$.

4 Holomorphic Poisson structures

In this section we prove an indefinite analog of the well-known result [20] that a generalized Kähler manifold carries a holomorphic Poisson structure. In fact, we have the following slightly more general result.

Theorem 3 *Let* (M, g) *be a pseudo-Riemannian manifold and let* J_+, J_- *be two complex structures on* M *compatible with* g *and such that* $d^+F^+ = -d^-F^-$. *Then* M *admits a* J_+*-holomorphic Poisson structure which vanishes iff* $[J^+, J^-] = 0$.

Proof: Let Π be the bivector field on M determined by the endomorphism $[J_+, J_-] - iJ_+[J_+, J_-]$ of $T^{\mathbb{C}}M$ and the complex bilinear extension of g. We shall prove that Π is a holomorphic Poisson field. To show that Π is holomorphic we shall use the Chern connection D^+ of the pseudo-Hermitian structure (g, J_+). It is defined by the identity $g(D^+_XY, Z) =$

$g(\nabla_X Y, Z) - \frac{1}{2}dF^+(J_\pm X, Y, Z)$ where ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of g. As in the positive case, D^+ is a Hermitian connection such that the restriction of its $(0,1)$ part on the holomorphic tangent bundle is the $\overline{\partial}$-operator of J_+.

In view of (4) and the identity $d^\pm F^\pm(X,Y,Z) = -dF^\pm(J_\pm X, J_\pm Y, J_\pm Z)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2g((D^+_X J_-)(Y), Z) = 2g(D^+_X J_- Y, Z) + 2g(D^+_X Y, J_- Z) = \\
&2g((\nabla_X J_-)(Y), Z) - dF^+(J_+X, J_-Y, Z) - dF^+(J_+X, Y, J_-Z) = \\
&dF^-(J_-X, Y, J_-Z) + dF^-(J_-X, J_-Y, Z) \\
&\qquad\qquad -dF^+(J_+X, J_-Y, Z) - dF^+(J_+X, Y, J_-Z) = \\
&d^-F^-(X, J_-Y, Z) + d^-F^-(X, Y, J_-Z) \\
&\qquad\qquad +d^+F^+(X, J_+J_-Y, J_+Z) + d^+F^+(X, J_+Y, J_+J_-Z)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
2g((D^+_X J_-)(Y), Z) = &-d^+F^+(X, J_-Y, Z) - d^+F^+(X, Y, J_-Z) \\
&+d^+F^+(X, J_+J_-Y, J_+Z) + d^+F^+(X, J_+Y, J_+J_-Z)
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The 3-form d^+F^+ has no $(3,0)$ and $(0,3)$-components, so

$$\begin{aligned}
&d^+F^+(A,B,C) = \\
&\qquad d^+F^+(J_+A, J_+B, C) + d^+F^+(J_+A, B, J_+C) + d^+F^+(A, J_+B, J_+C)
\end{aligned}$$

Applying this identity to the last two terms in (6) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
2g((D^+_X J_-)(Y), Z) = &-d^+F^+(J_+X, J_-Y, J_+Z) - d^+F^+(J_+X, J_+J_-Y, Z) \\
&-d^+F^+(J_+X, Y, J_+J_-Z) - d^+F^+(J_+X, J_+Y, J_-Z)
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Set $Q = [J_+, J_-]$. Then, since $D^+J_+ = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2g((D^+_X Q)(Y), Z) - g((D^+_{J_+X} Q)(Y), J_+Z) = \\
&-g((D^+_X J_-)(Y), J_+Z) - g((D^+_X J_-)(J_+Y), Z) \\
&-g((D^+_{J_+X} J_-)(Y), Z) + g((D^+_{J_+X} J_-)(J_+Y), J_+Z)
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (6) to the first and the second term, and (7) to the third and the fourth term, we easily get

$$g((D^+_X Q)(Y), Z) - g((D^+_{J_+X} Q)(Y), J_+Z) = 0 \tag{8}$$

As in [3] and [20], consider the form $\Omega(X,Y) = g(QX,Y)$. The $(1,1)$-part of this form with respect to J_+ vanishes since

$$\Omega(J_+X, J_+Y) = -g(J_+^2 J_- J_+X, Y) - g(J_- J_+^2 X, J_+Y) =$$
$$g(J_- J_+X, Y) + g(J_-X, J_+Y) = -\Omega(X,Y).$$

Then the $(0,2)$-component of Ω is

$$\begin{gathered}\Omega^{(0,2)}(X,Y) = \Omega^{(0,2)}(X^{(0,1)}, Y^{(0,1)}) = \Omega(X^{(0,1)}, Y^{(0,1)}) = \\ \tfrac{1}{4}[\Omega(X,Y) - \Omega(J_+X, J_+Y)] + \tfrac{1}{4}i[\Omega(J_+X,Y) + \Omega(X, J_+Y)] = \\ \tfrac{1}{2}[\Omega(X,Y) + i\Omega(X, J_+Y)] = \tfrac{1}{2}[g(QX,Y) + ig(QX, J_+Y)] = \tfrac{1}{2}g(\Pi, X\wedge Y)\end{gathered} \tag{9}$$

It follows that Π is of type $(2,0)$ with respect to J_+. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&g(D^+_{X+iJ_+X}\Pi, Y\wedge Z) = 2(D^+_{X+iJ_+X}\Omega^{(0,2)})(Y,Z) = \\ &[g((D^+_X Q)(Y), Z) + ig((D^+_X Q)(Y), J_+Z)] \\ &\quad + i[g((D^+_{J_+X} Q)(Y), Z) + ig((D^+_{J_+X} Q)(Y), J_+Z)] = \\ &[g((D^+_X Q)(Y), Z) - g((D^+_{J_+X} Q)(Y), J_+Z)] \\ &\quad + i[g((D^+_X Q)(Y), J_+Z) + g((D^+_{J_+X} Q)(Y), Z)]\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (8), $g(D^+_{X+iJ_+X}\Pi, Y\wedge Z) = 0$ for every $X,Y,Z \in TM$. This shows that $D^+_{X+iJ_+X}\Pi = 0$, therefore Π is a holomorphic section of the anti-canonical bundle $\Lambda^2 T^{(1,0)}M$ of (M, J_+).

To prove that the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket $[\Pi,\Pi]$ vanishes we note first that it is enough to show that $[Re\Pi, Re\Pi] = 0$. Indeed, since Π is holomorphic, it is easy to see in local holomorphic coordinates that $[\overline{\Pi}, \Pi] = 0$. Note also that $[Re\Pi, Im\Pi] = [Im\Pi, Re\Pi]$ since $Re\Pi$ and $Im\Pi$ are of degree 2. Thus we have $0 = [\overline{\Pi}, \Pi] = [Re\Pi, Re\Pi] + [Im\Pi, Im\Pi]$. Suppose that $[Re\Pi, Re\Pi] = 0$. Then we get $[Im\Pi, Im\Pi] = 0$, hence $[\Pi,\Pi] = 2i[Re\Pi, Im\Pi]$. Because $[\Pi,\Pi]$ is of type (3,0) and purely imaginary, we conclude that $[\Pi,\Pi] = 0$

According to (9), the endomorphism Q of TM corresponds to the bivector field $Re\Pi$ via the metric g. Then, in view of [27, Proposition 1.9], the equality $[Re\Pi, Re\Pi] = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\mathfrak{S} g((\nabla_{QX} Q)(Y), Z) = 0,$$

where $\mathfrak{S}$ means the cyclic sum over X, Y, Z and ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of g. To prove the latter identity we use the fact that the Levi-Civita connection ∇ and the Chern connection D^+ of (g, J_+) are related by

$$g(\nabla_X Y, Z) = g(D^+_X Y, Z) - \frac{1}{2} d^+F^+(X, J_+Y, J_+Z).$$

Set $P = J_+J_- + J_-J_+$. Then, by (6) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2g((\nabla_X Q)(Y), Z) = 2g((\nabla_X QY, Z) + 2g(\nabla_X Y, QZ) = \\
&2g((D^+_X Q)(Y), Z) - d^+F^+(X, J_+QY, J_+Z) - d^+F^+(X, J_+Y, J_+QZ) = \\
&d^+F^+(X, PY, Z) + d^+F^+(X, Y, PZ) \\
&\qquad\qquad +2d^+F^+(X, J_-Y, J_+Z) + 2d^+F^+(X, J_+Y, J_-Z).
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
2\mathfrak{S}g((\nabla_{QX} Q)(Y), Z) = \mathfrak{S}[&d^+F^+(QX, PY, Z) + d^+F^+(QX, Y, PZ) \\
&+2d^+F^+(QX, J_-Y, J_+Z) + d^+F^+(QX, J_+Y, J_-Z)]
\end{aligned}$$

Using the skew-symmetry of d^+F^+, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{S}[d^+F^+(QX, PY, Z) + d^+F^+(QX, Y, PZ)] = \\
&2\mathfrak{S}[d^+F^+(J_+J_-X, J_+J_-Y, Z) - d^+F^+(J_-J_+X, J_-J_+Y, Z)].
\end{aligned}$$

We have $d^+F^+ = -d^-F^-$, so d^+F^+ is of type $(2,1)+(1,2)$ for both J_+ and J_-. Therefore

$$d^+F^+(A, B, C) = \mathfrak{S}d^+F^+(J_+A, J_+B, C) = \mathfrak{S}d^+F^+(J_-A, J_-B, C).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathfrak{S}g((\nabla_{QX} Q)(Y), Z) = \\
&\qquad \mathfrak{S}[d^+F^+(J_+J_-X, J_+J_-Y, Z) - d^+F^+(J_-J_+X, J_-J_+Y, Z) \\
&\qquad\quad d^+F^+(J_+J_-X, J_-Y, J_+Z) - d^+F^+(J_-J_+X, J_-Y, J_+Z) \\
&\qquad\quad d^+F^+(J_+J_-X, J_+Y, J_-Z) - d^+F^+(J_-J_+X, J_+Y, J_-Z)] = \\
&\qquad \mathfrak{S}[d^+F^+(J_-X, J_-Y, Z) - d^+F^+(J_+X, J_+Y, Z) \\
&\qquad\quad d^+F^+(J_-X, J_-Y, Z) - d^+F^+(J_+X, Y, J_+Z) \\
&\qquad\quad d^+F^+(J_-X, Y, J_-Z) - d^+F^+(J_+X, J_+Y, Z)] = \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad 3[d^+F^+(X, Y, Z) - d^+F^+(X, Y, Z)] = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves that $[Re\Pi, Re\Pi] = 0$ which imples, as we have mentioned, that $[\Pi, \Pi] = 0$, i.e. Π is a Poisson field.

One can also prove that the field Π is Poisson using the fact that the 2-vector corresponding to the endomorphism $J_+ + J_-$ is Poisson [25] and its $(2,0)$-part is a constant multiple of Π. *q. e. d.*

A holomorphic Poisson structure on a complex surface is merely a holomorphic section of its anti-canonical bundle. Using this fact N.Hitchin [20] proposed a simple way for constructing generalized Kähler structures on Del Pezzo surfaces. A different approach by M. Gualtieri [17] based on the notion of generalized complex branes extends this construction to higher-dimensional Fano manifolds. Here, we state a modification of his result which can be proved in the same way as [17, Theorem 7.1]

Theorem 4 *Let L be a holomorphic line bundle on an n-dimensional compact complex manifold M with holomorphic Poisson structure σ such that $c_1(L)^n \neq 0$. Let (g_0, J_0) be a pseudo-Kähler structure with Kähler form $F_0 \in c_1(L)$. Consider σ and F_0 as homomorphisms $\sigma : (T^{\mathbb{C}}M)^* \to T^{\mathbb{C}}M$ and $F_0 : T^{\mathbb{C}}M \to (T^{\mathbb{C}}M)^*$, and suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) $\sigma \circ F_0 = \overline{\partial} X^{1,0}$ for some $(1,0)$ vector field $X^{1,0}$;

(ii) $[Re\, X^{1,0}, Im\, \sigma] = 0$ for the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket.

Then the choice of a Hermitian structure on L with curvature F_0 determines a family of generalized pseudo-Kähler structures (g_t, J_t, J_0) with $J_t = \phi_t^*(J_0)$ for a 1-parameter group of diffeomorphisms ϕ_t such that $J_t = J_0$ for $t \neq 0$ only at the poins of M where $\sigma = 0$.

Using Theorem 4 or the construction in [21] one expects to produce examples of generalized pseudo-Kähler structures on ruled surfaces over a Riemann surface of genus greater than one. For example, consider a ruled surface M over a curve C of genus $g > 1$ obtained as a projectivization of a vector bundle V of degree $deg(V) < 2 - 3g$. Its anti-canonical bundle has a nowhere-vanishing holomorphic section s and a choice of a Hermitian metric on it will produce a curvature 2-form $F_0 = dd^c log|s|^2$. Suppose that F_0 is non-degenerate at each point. Then Theorem 4 and [21] produce generalized pseudo-Kähler structure with non-trivial canonical bundle. Note that when $V = \mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{L}$ is decomposable, the admissible metrics on M considered in [2] define Hermitian metrics on the anti-canonical bundle of M which are candidates to provide such F_0. However one can check that none of these metrics has a non-degenerate Ricci tensor. In case $deg(V) > 2-2g$, there are metrics with this property but there is no holomorphic Poisson structure. So it is an open question whether any ruled surface admits a generalized pseudo-Kähler structure. Note that R. Goto [15] has recently constructed positive definite generalized pseudo-Kähler structures on some of these surfaces using more general deformations of Kähler Poisson structures [14] than that considered in [17]. However this approach is based on elliptic methods and can not be adapted directly to the pseudo-Riemannian case.

Example 1. Consider the complex flag manifold $Fl = \{(L,V)|\ 0 \in L \subset V \subset \mathbb{C}^3, dim\, L = 1, dim\, V = 2\}$. It can be embedded into $\mathbb{CP}^2 \times \mathbb{CP}^2$ as the quadric $Fl = \{(x_0,x_1,x_2;y_0,y_1,y_2) \in \mathbb{CP}^2 \times \mathbb{CP}^2|\ x_0y_0 + x_1y_1 + x_2y_2 = 0\}$. Let ω be the Kähler form of the standard Kähler structure on $\mathbb{CP}^2$ normalized so that ω be integral. Denote by p_1 and p_2 the projections of $\mathbb{CP}^2 \times \mathbb{CP}^2$ onto the first and the second factor. Set $\omega_1 = p_1^*\omega$ and $\omega_2 = p_2^*\omega$. The restrictions of these forms to Fl will be denote by the same symbols. We claim that there are integers a and b with $ab < 0$ and $a+b \neq 0$ such that $F = a\omega_1 + b\omega_2$ is a non-degenerate form on FL. Suppose that for every such a and b the form $F = a\omega_1 + b\omega_2$ is degenerate at some point of Fl. The group $U(3)$, embedded diagonally in $U(3) \times U(3)$, acts transitively and holomorphically on Fl and the form F is invariant under this action. It follows that F degenerates at every point of Fl. This implies that the top degree F^3 vanishes since $degF = 2$. We have $\omega_i^3 = (p_i^*\omega^3)|Fl = 0$ for $i = 1,2$. Therefore $F^3 = 3ab(a\,\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 + b\,\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2^2)$. Thus $a\,\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 + b\,\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2^2 = 0$ for every two integers a and b with $ab < 0$, $a+b \neq 0$. It follows that $\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 = 0$ and $\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2^2 = 0$. Then $(\omega_1+\omega_2)^3 = 3(\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 + \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2^2) = 0$. But the latter identity does not hold since $\omega_1 + \omega_2$ is the Kähler form of Fl, a contradiction. This proves our claim. Fix integers a and b with $ab < 0$, $a+b \neq 0$ for which $F_0 = a\omega_1 + b\omega_2$ is non-degenerate. Then F_0 determines a pseudo-Kähler metric on Fl. Since the form F_0 is integral, it determines a Hermitian holomorphic line bundle L on Fl with curvature F_0. It is not hard to see that $c_1(L)^3 \neq 0$. Indeed, $c_1(L)^3$ is represented by the form F_0^3, so if $c_1(L)^3 = 0$, this form is exact. Since F_0^3 is invariant under the action of $U(3)$, we have $F_0^3 = \lambda(volume)$ for some constant λ. Integrating the latter identity over Fl we get $\lambda = 0$, so $F_0^3 = 0$. This implies $a\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 + b\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2^2 = 0$. Let $\psi : Fl \to Fl$ be the holomorphic map defined by $\psi([x],[y]) = ([y],[x])$. It clear that $\psi^*\omega_1 = \omega_2$ and $\psi^*\omega_2 = \omega_1$. Therefore $0 = \psi^*(a\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 + b\omega_1 \wedge$

$\omega_2^2) = a\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2^2 + b\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2$. Then $(a+b)(\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 + \omega_1 \wedge_2^2) = 0$ and we get the identity $(\omega_1 + \omega_2)^3 = 3(\omega_1^2 \wedge \omega_2 + \omega_1 \wedge_2^2) = 0$ which is not true. It follows that that $c_1(L)^3 \neq 0$. Now we want to define a holomorphic Poisson structure on Fl as $\sigma = Z_1 \wedge Z_2$ for two commuting holomorphic vector fields. Let Z_1 and Z_2 be the fields on $\mathbb{CP}^2 \times \mathbb{CP}^2$ generated by the complex 1-parameter groups $(x_0, x_1, x_2; y_0, y_1, y_2) \to (e^t x_0, e^{-t} x_1, x_2; e^{-t} y_0, e^t y_1, y_2)$ and $(x_0, x_1, x_2; y_0, y_1, y_2) \to (e^t x_0, x_1, e^{-t} x_2; e^{-t} y_0, y_1, e^t y_2)$, respectively. Clearly Z_1 and Z_2 are commuting holomorphic vector fields tangent to Fl. Then $Z_1 \wedge Z_2$ is a holomorphic Poisson structure on Fl. To show that Fl admits a generalized pseudo-Kähler structure it remains only to check conditions (i) and (ii) in Theorem 4. Denote by X the holomorphic vector field on $\mathbb{CP}^2$ generated by the group $(x_0, x_1, x_2) \to (e^t x_0, e^{-t} x_1, x_2)$. Then $Z_1 = (X \circ p_1, -X \circ p_2)$. Similarly $Z_2 = (Y \circ p_1, -Y \circ p_2)$ where Y is the vector field on $\mathbb{CP}^2$ generated by the group $(x_0, x_1, x_2) \to (e^t x_0, x_1, e^{-t} x_2)$ The bi-vector filed $\tau = X \wedge Y$ is a holomorphic section of the anti-canonical bundle of $\mathbb{CP}^2$. Set $f = \ln ||\tau||^2$ where the norm is taken with respect to metric yielded by the normalized Fubini-Study metric g of $\mathbb{CP}^2$. We claim that, although f is defined only out of the zero set of τ, the functions Xf and Yf are globally defined and smooth. To check this we use the standard coordinates of $\mathbb{C}P^2$. For the coordinates $z_1 = \dfrac{x_1}{x_0}$, $z_2 = \dfrac{x_2}{x_0}$, set

$$g_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} = g(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_\alpha}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \overline{z}_\beta}) \quad \text{and} \quad G_{(z)} = g_{1\overline{1}} g_{2\overline{2}} - |g_{1\overline{2}}|^2.$$

Then $||\tau||^2 = 4|z_1 z_2|^2 G_{(z)}$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} &X = -2z_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} - z_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}, \quad Y = -z_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}, \quad \tau = 2z_1 z_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}, \\ &Xf = -3 - 2z_1 \frac{\ln G_{(z)}}{\partial z_1} - z_2 \frac{\ln G_{(z)}}{\partial z_2}, \quad Yf = -1 - z_2 \frac{\ln G_{(z)}}{\partial z_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

In the coordinates $u_1 = \dfrac{x_0}{x_1}$, $u_2 = \dfrac{x_2}{x_1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &X = 2u_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial u_1} + u_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial u_2}, \quad Y = -u_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial u_2}, \quad \tau = -2u_1 u_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}, \\ &Xf = 3 + 2u_1 \frac{\ln G_{(u)}}{\partial u_1} + u_2 \frac{\ln G_{(u)}}{\partial u_2}, \quad Yf = -1 - u_2 \frac{\ln G_{(u)}}{\partial u_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Finally, in the coordinates $v_1 = \dfrac{x_0}{x_2}$, $v_2 = \dfrac{x_1}{x_2}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&X = v_1\frac{\partial}{\partial v_1} - v_2\frac{\partial}{\partial v_2}, \quad Y = v_1\frac{\partial}{\partial v_1} + v_2\frac{\partial}{\partial v_2}, \quad \tau = 2v_1v_2\frac{\partial}{\partial v_1} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial v_2},\\
&Xf = v_1\frac{\ln G_{(v)}}{\partial v_1} - v_2\frac{\ln G_{(v)}}{\partial v_2}, \quad Yf = 2 + v_1\frac{\ln G_{(v)}}{\partial v_1} - v_2\frac{\ln G_{(v)}}{\partial v_2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

It follows from (11), (12), (13) that τ vanishes on the analytic set $C = \{[x] \in \mathbb{CP}^2 : x_0x_1x_2 = 0\}$ and that Xf, Yf can be extended to smooth functions on a neighborhood of every point of C. Since $\mathbb{CP}^2 \setminus C$ is dense, we see that Xf, Yf can be extended to unique smooth functions on the whole space $\mathbb{CP}^2$. We shall denote the extensions by the same symbols. Identities (11), (12), (13) imply also that if $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ is a standard coordinate system of $\mathbb{CP}^2$, we have $dd^c \ln ||\tau||^2 = dd^c \ln G_{(\zeta)}$ on $\mathbb{CP}^2 \setminus C$. Therefore $dd^c \ln ||\tau||^2$ on $\mathbb{CP}^2 \setminus C$ is the Ricci from of the standard Kähler structure on $\mathbb{CP}^2$. As it is well-known, the Ricci form of this structure is equal to 3 times the Kähler form. Thus, since we are working with the normalized Kähler form, we have $dd^c \ln ||\tau||^2 = 3\lambda\omega$ where $\lambda > 0$ is a constant. Hence, for $k = 1, 2$, $dd^c(\ln ||\tau||^2 \circ p_k) = 3\lambda p_k^*\omega = 3\lambda\,\omega_k$ on the set $M = \{(x_0, x_1, x_2; y_0, y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{CP}^2 \times \mathbb{CP}^2 |\ x_0x_1x_2y_0y_1y_2 \neq 0\}$. Thus on M we have

$$(Z_1 \wedge Z_2) \circ F_0 = \frac{1}{3\lambda}(Z_1 \wedge Z_2)(a\, dd^c(\ln ||\tau||^2 \circ p_1) + b\, dd^c(\ln ||\tau||^2 \circ p_2)) \tag{14}$$

Now we need the following

Lemma 5 *Let U and V be commuting holomorphic vector fields on a complex manifold and φ a smooth function on the manifold. Then*

$$(U \wedge V) \circ dd^c\varphi = i\overline{\partial}((U\varphi)V - (V\varphi)U).$$

Proof. We use the identity $d^c = \frac{1}{2}(i\overline{\partial} - i\partial)$ and the fact for any $(0,1)$-vector field Z, $[U, Z]^{(1,0)} = 0$ to calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
2(dd^c\varphi)(U, Z) &= iU(\overline{\partial}\varphi(Z)) + iZ(\partial\varphi(U)) - i\overline{\partial}\varphi([U, Z]) = \\
&\quad iUZ\varphi + iZU\varphi - [U, Z]\varphi = 2iZU\varphi,
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\imath_U dd^c\varphi = i\overline{\partial}(U\varphi).$$

From here

$$(U\wedge V)\circ dd^c\varphi = \imath_U dd^c\varphi\otimes V - \imath_V dd^c\varphi\otimes U \;=\; i\overline{\partial}(U\varphi)\otimes V - i\overline{\partial}(V\varphi)\otimes U = i\overline{\partial}((U\varphi)V-(V\varphi)U).$$

Q. E. D.

It follows from (14) and Lemma 5 that if we set

$$X^{1,0} = \frac{i}{3\lambda}\{[a(Xf)\circ p_1 - b(Xf)\circ p_2]Z_2 - [a(Yf)\circ p_1 - b(Yf)\circ p_2]Z_1\}$$

where $f=\ln||\tau||^2$ as above, we have $(Z_1\wedge Z_2)\circ F_0 = \overline{\partial}X^{1,0}$ on the open set M. This identity holds everywhere since the vector field $X^{1,0}$ is smooth on $\mathbb{CP}^2\times\mathbb{CP}^2$ and M is dense. Thus condition (i) of Theorem 4 is satisfied for $\sigma = Z_1\wedge Z_2$. To show that condition (ii) also holds, we note that

$$[X^{1,0}, Z_1\wedge Z_2] = -\frac{i}{3\lambda}\{a([X,Y]f)\circ p_1 + b([X,Y]f)\circ p_2\}Z_1\wedge Z_2 = 0$$

since $[X,Y]=0$. The function f is real-valued, so $\overline{Xf}=\overline{X}f$, $\overline{Yf}=\overline{Y}f$ and we have

$$[\overline{X^{1,0}}, \overline{Z}_1\wedge\overline{Z}_2] = \frac{i}{3\lambda}\{a(\overline{[X,Y]}f)\circ p_1 + b(\overline{[X,Y]}f)\circ p_2\}\overline{Z}_1\wedge\overline{Z}_2 = 0.$$

Using the identities $[X,\overline{X}]=[Y,\overline{Y}]=[X,\overline{Y}]=[\overline{X},Y]=0$, it is easy to see that

$$[X^{1,0}, \overline{Z}_1\wedge\overline{Z}_2] - [\overline{X^{1,0}}, Z_1\wedge Z_2] = 0.$$

It follows that $[Re\,X^{1,0}, Im(Z_1\wedge Z_2)]=0$. Then, by Theorem 4, the flag manifold Fl admits a generalized pseudo-Kähler structure. Note that Fl admits also a usual generalized Kähler structure [14].

Corollary 6 *Any holomorphic line bundle on the 3-dimensional flag manifold Fl carries a structure of holomorphic Poisson module with respect to the holomorphic Poisson structure $U_1\wedge U_2$ defined by commuting holomorphic vector fields U_1 and U_2.*

Proof:

First we notice that any two commuting vector fields on Fl span a maximal torus in the algebra $sl(3,\mathbb{C})$ of the holomorphic vector fields on Fl and all such tori are conjugate in the group of biholomorphisms. So we may assume that the vector fields in the Corollary are Z_1 and Z_2 above. Denote by K the canonical bundle of $\mathbb{CP}^2$. It is well known that every holomorphic line bundle over Fl is of the form $L_{mn} = \frac{m}{3}p_1^*K + \frac{n}{3}p_2^*K$ where $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. If we consider K with the metric induced by the normalized metric of $\mathbb{CP}^2$, the curvature form of K with respect to its canonical connection is equal to the Kähler form ω. Therefore the form $\frac{m}{3}p_1^*\omega + \frac{n}{3}p_2^*\omega = \frac{m}{3}\omega_1 + \frac{n}{3}\omega_2$ represents the first Chern class of L_{mn}. Denote this form by F and set $\sigma = Z_1 \wedge Z_2$. We have seen above that there is a $(1,0)$-vector field $X^{1,0}$ such that $\sigma \circ X^{1,0} = \overline{\partial} X^{1,0}$ and $[X^{1,0}, \sigma] = 0$. Now the Corollary follows from [17, Proposition 10] since the first Chern class of L_{mn} coincides with its Atiyah class.

5 The four-dimensional case

In dimension four, a pseudo-hermitian metric is either positive (negative) definite or of signature (2,2). Using the results in Section 4 we shall prove the following:

Theorem 7 *Let (M, g, J_+, J_-) be a compact pseudo-bihermitian 4-manifold.*

i) If $d^+F^+ = -d^-F^-$, then (M, J_+) (and (M, J_-)) is one of the following complex surfaces: a complex torus, a K3 surface, a primary Kodaira surface, a blow-up of a surface of class VII_0, a ruled surface described in [7] with $\chi \pm \tau$ divisible by 4, where χ and τ are the Euler characteristic and the signature of M.

ii) If the bihermitian structure is strict, then (M, J_+) (and (M, J_-)) is one of the following: a complex torus, a K3 surface, a primary Kodaira surface, a properly elliptic surface of odd first Betti number, a Hopf surface, a minimal Inoue surface without curves.

Proof: According to Theorem 3, in part *i*) there is a non-zero holomorphic section of the anti-canonical bundle of (M, J_+). Such surfaces with even first Betti number are described in [7] and they exhaust the first four cases in *i*). The restriction on $\chi \pm \tau$ in the last case comes from Matsushita's topological condition for existence of a split-signature metric [26]. For the case of surfaces with odd first Betti number, we notice that the proof of Proposition 2.3 in [8] shows that either the Kodaira dimension of (M, J_+) (and (M, J_-)) is $-\infty$ or its canonical bundle is holomorphically trivial.

Then the Kodaira classification of minimal compact complex surfaces [6] leads to the list in *i*).

Part *ii*) follows from the fact that the canonical bundle is topologically trivial in the case of strictly pseudo-bihermitian surfaces, since the 2-form $\Omega^{(0,2)}$ given by (9) provides a non-vanishing section. So one can use the well-known list of the surfaces with vanishing first Chern class [29] *q. e. d.*

Remarks. 1.Notice that by Lemma 2.1 in [7] if a compact complex surface is not minimal and has a nowhere-vanishing holomorphic section of the anti-canonical bundle, then its minimal model also admits such a section. Moreover the dimension of the space of holomorphic sections decreases by at most one after a blow-up. It keeps the same dimension only if the blow-up is at a base point of the anti-canonical linear system. This leads to additional restrictions on the possible blow-ups of surfaces in case *i*), but we shall not discuss this question here.

2. There are generalized pseudo-Kähler manifolds (M, g, J_+, J_-) so that J_+ and J_- induce opposite orientations. In the four dimensional case such structures commute. In any dimension, for a generalized pseudo-Kähler manifold with commuting J_+ and J_-, the same reasoning as in [5] shows that the holomorphic tangent bundle of (M, J_+) splits in a sum of two holomorphic subbundles. Conversely, if the holomorphic tangent bundle of a compact complex surface (M, J) splits, then by [5] there is a generalized (pseudo) Kähler structure (g, J_+, J_-) such that $J_+ = J$ and $[J_+, J_-] = 0$.

Example 2. It have been observed in [3, 16, 20] that one can explicitly define a generalized Kähler structure by means of a hyperkähler structure. Given a para-hyperkähler structure, a similar construction can be applied to obtain a generalized pseudo-Kähler structure. Let $\{g, J_1, J_2, J_3\}$ be a para-hyperkähler structure on a 4-manifold M with $J_1^2 = -J_2^2 = -J_3^2 = -Id$ and $J_3 = J_1 J_2$. We would like to construct two commuting generalized almost complex structures I_1 and I_2 following [20]. To do this we need complex valued 2-forms β_1 and β_2 on M which satisfy

$$(\beta_1 - \beta_2)^2 = (\beta_1 - \overline{\beta_2})^2 = 0, \ \beta_1 \neq \beta_2, \ \beta_1 \neq \overline{\beta_2} \ \text{ at every point.} \qquad (15)$$

We set $\exp(\beta_k) = 1 + \beta_k + \frac{1}{2}\beta_k^2$, $k = 1, 2$, and $(X + \xi).\exp(\beta_k) = \imath_X \exp(\beta_k) + \xi \wedge \exp(\beta_k)$ for $X + \xi \in TM \oplus T^*M$ (the Clifford action of $TM \oplus T^*M$ on the forms). Then $E_k = \{A \in (TM \oplus T^*M)^{\mathbb{C}} \mid A.\exp(\beta_k) = 0\}$ is the $+i$-eigenspace of a generalized almost complex structure I_k. If β_k is closed, I_k is Courant integrable [16, 20]. It is shown in [20, Lemma 1] that I_1 and I_2 commute. Moreover, $E_1 \cap E_2 \oplus \overline{E_1} \cap \overline{E_2}$ is the (-1)-eigenspace of $I_1 I_2$ and $E_1 \cap \overline{E_2} \oplus \overline{E_1} \cap E_2$ is the $(+1)$-eigenspace. Note also that $E_1 \cap E_2 = \{U - \imath_U\beta_1 \mid U \in T^{\mathbb{C}}M,\ \imath_U\beta_1 = \imath_U\beta_2\}$ ([20]). Thus, for $A = U - \imath_U\beta_1 \in E_1 \cap E_2$, $B = V - \imath_V\beta_1 \in E_1 \cap E_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} < A + \overline{A}, B + \overline{B} > &= -Re\{(\beta_1 - \overline{\beta_1})(U, \overline{V})\} = -Re\{(\beta_2 - \overline{\beta_2})(U, \overline{V})\} \\ &= -Re\{(\beta_1 - \overline{\beta_2})(U, \overline{V})\} \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Now, given a para-hyperkähler structure $\{g, J_1, J_2, J_3\}$ on a 4-manifold M, set $J_+ = J_1$ and $J_- = aJ_1 + bJ_2 + cJ_3$ where a, b, c are fixed numbers such that $a^2 - b^2 - c^2 = 1$ and $a \neq 1$. Then J_+ and J_- are complex structures compatible with the metric g satisfying the identity

$$J_+J_- + J_-J_+ = -2aId. \tag{17}$$

As in Section 2, set

$$K = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{a^2-1}}[J_+, J_-],\ S_+ = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}(J_- - aJ_+)$$

Then $\{g, J_+, K, S_+\}$ is a para-hyperhermitian structure with $S_+ = J_+K$. Let $F^+(X,Y) = g(J_+X, Y)$, $F^K(X,Y) = g(KX,Y)$ and $\omega'(X,Y) = g(S_+X, Y)$ be the corresponding fundamental 2-forms. Similarly, if

$$S_- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}(J_+ - aJ_-),$$

then $\{g, J_-, K, S_-\}$ is a para-hyperhermitian structure with $S_- = J_-K$. We denote the fundamental 2-forms of J_- and S_- by F^- and ω'', respectively. Set

$$\omega_+ = \omega' + \omega'', \quad \omega_- = \omega' - \omega''.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_+(X,Y) &= \sqrt{\frac{a+1}{a-1}}g(J_+X - J_-X, Y) = \sqrt{\frac{a+1}{a-1}}(F^+(X,Y) - F^-(X,Y)) \\ \omega_-(X,Y) &= \sqrt{\frac{a-1}{a+1}}g(J_+X + J_-X, Y) = \sqrt{\frac{a-1}{a+1}}(F^+(X,Y) + F^-(X,Y)) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

In particular, the forms ω_+ and ω_- are closed since F^+ and F^- are so. Identity (10) implies that $\nabla[J_+, J_-] = 0$, thus $\nabla K = 0$. Therefore the form F^K is also closed. Now, similar to [16] we set

$$\beta_1 = F^K + i\omega_+, \quad \beta_2 = -F^K + i\omega_-.$$

Conditions (15) for these forms are equivalent to

$$F^K\omega_+ = F^K\omega_- = \omega_+\omega_- = \omega_+^2 + \omega_-^2 - 4(F^K)^2 = 0. \tag{19}$$

Let X be a tangent vector with $g(X,X) = 1$. Then $\{X, J_+X, KX, S_+X\}$ is a g-orthonormal basis of tangent vectors. Using (17), (18) and the paraquaternionic identities, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_\pm(X, J_+X) = -\omega_\pm(KX, S_+X) = \mp\sqrt{a^2-1},\\
&\omega_\pm(X, KX) = \omega_\pm(S_+X, J_+X) = 0\\
&\omega_\pm(X, S_+X) = \omega_\pm(J_+X, KX) = \mp(a \pm 1).
\end{aligned}$$

These identities imply that

$$\begin{gathered}
(\omega_+ \wedge \omega_+)(X, J_+X, KX, S_+X) = 4(a+1),\\
(\omega_- \wedge \omega_-)(X, J_+X, KX, S_+X) = -4(a-1),\\
(\omega_+ \wedge \omega_-)(X, J_+X, KX, S_+X) = 0, \quad (F^K \wedge \omega_\pm)(X, J_+X, KX, S_+X) = 0.
\end{gathered}$$

We also have $(F^K \wedge F^K)(X, J_+X, KX, S_+X) = 2$. It follows that identities (19) are satisfied.

The identity $\beta_1 - \beta_2 = 2F^K + i(\omega_+ - \omega_-)$ imply that a vector $U \in T^{\mathbb{C}}M$ satisfies $\imath_U(\beta_1 - \beta_2) = 0$ if and only if

$$\sqrt{a^2-1}KU + iJ_+U - iaJ_-U = 0. \tag{20}$$

Thus $E_1 \cap E_2 = \{U - \imath_U\beta_1 \mid U \in T^{\mathbb{C}}M,\ U \text{ satisfies (20)}\}$. Let L^- be the (-1)-eigenspace of I_1I_2 acting on $TM \oplus T^*M$. Any $X + \xi \in L^-$ can be written as $X + \xi = U + \overline{U}$ where $U = \frac{1}{2}(X + iY) \in E_1 \cap E_2$, $Y \in TM$, and $\xi = \imath_U\beta_1 - \imath_{\overline{U}}\overline{\beta_1}$. In this notation, (20) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{a^2-1}KX - J_+Y + aJ_-Y = 0\\
&\sqrt{a^2-1}KY + J_+X - aJ_-X = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

In fact, either of these identities is a consequence of the other one. For every $V = \frac{1}{2}(Z + iT) \in E_1 \cap E_2$, we have

$$Re(\beta_1 - \overline{\beta}_1)(U, \overline{V}) = \sqrt{\frac{a+1}{a-1}}[g(J_+X - J_-X, T) - g(J_+Y - J_-Y, Z)] =$$
$$-\sqrt{\frac{a+1}{a-1}}[g(X, J_+T - J_-T) + g(J_+Y - J_-Y, Z)].$$

Applying K to the second identity of (21) we get $\sqrt{a^2-1}Y = S_+X - aS_-X$. This gives

$$\sqrt{a^2-1}J_+Y = -KX + \frac{a}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}X + \frac{a^2}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}J_+J_-X,$$
$$\sqrt{a^2-1}J_-Y = aKX + \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}X + \frac{a}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}J_-J_+X.$$

It follows that

$$\sqrt{a^2-1}(J_+Y - J_-Y) = (a-1)(a+2)KX + \frac{a-1}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}X.$$

Similarly,

$$\sqrt{a^2-1}(J_+T - J_-T) = (a-1)(a+2)KZ + \frac{a-1}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}Z.$$

Then

$$(a-1)Re(\beta_1 - \overline{\beta}_1)(U, \overline{V}) = -\sqrt{\frac{a-1}{a+1}}g(X, Z). \qquad (22)$$

Suppose that $< X + \xi, A >= 0$ for every $A \in L^-$. Take any $Z \in TM$ and set

$$T = (a^2-1)^{-1/2}[S_+Z - aS_-Z].$$

Then $V = \frac{1}{2}(Z + iT)$ satisfies (20). Indeed we have

$$\sqrt{a^2-1}KZ - J_+T + aJ_-T =$$
$$\sqrt{a^2-1}KZ - \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}(-KZ - aJ_+S_-Z) + \frac{a}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}(J_-S_+Z + aKZ) =$$
$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}(2a^2KZ + a(J_+S_-Z + J_-S_+Z)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}(2a^2KZ - a^2\frac{[J_+, J_-]Z}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}) =$$
$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2-1}}(2a^2KZ - 2a^2KZ) = 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\sqrt{a^2-1}KT + J_+Z - aJ_-Z = KS_+Z - aKS_-Z + J_+Z - aJ_-Z = 0.$$

Thus $V \in E_1 \cap E_2$ and, by our assumption, (16) and (22), we have $g(X, Z) = 0$. Since the latter identity holds for every Z, we conclude that $X = 0$. Then $Y = (a^2-1)^{-1/2}[S_+X - aS_-X] = 0$, hence $U = 0$, thus $\xi = \imath_U\beta_1 - \imath_{\overline{U}}\overline{\beta_1} = 0$. This proves that the canonical inner product on $TM \oplus T^*M$ is non-degenerate on L^-. Moreover, the inclusion $TM \cap L^- \subset E_1 \cap E_2$ and identity (20) imply that $TM \cap L^- = \{0\}$. Similar arguments show that the metric $< . , . >$ is non-degenerate on the $(+1)$-eigenspace L^+ of I_1I_2 and $TM \cap L^+ = \{0\}$. Thus I_1, I_2 is a generalized pseudo-Kähler structure on M. We can deform this structure using arbitrary smooth function f on M. Let H_t be the flow of the F^K-Hamiltonian vector field $\imath_{df}F^K$, so $H_t^*(F^K) = F^K$. Define

$$\gamma_1 = F^K + i(\omega' + H_t^*\omega''), \quad \gamma_2 = -F^K + i(\omega' - H_t^*\omega'').$$

Then $\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 = 2F^K + 2iH_t^*\omega'' = H_t^*(2F^K + 2i\omega'') = H_t^*(\beta_1 - \beta_2)$ and $\gamma_1 - \overline{\gamma}_2 = \beta_1 - \overline{\beta}_2$. It follows that for small t, the forms γ_1 and γ_2 define a generalized pseudo-Kähler structure .

Finally, let us note that a generalized pseudo-Kähler structure can be explicitly define by means of the pseudo-Kähler structures (g, J_+), (g, J_-) and [16, (6.14)].

These constructions can be applied to 4-tori and primary Kodaira surfaces since each of these surfaces admits a para-hyperkähler strucure (see, for example [22, 23]. Recall that the Kodaira surfaces do not admit any (positive) generalized Kähler structure [4, 5].

Example 3. Any para-hyperhermitian structure which is locally conformally para-hyperkähler can be deformed as in [3] to obtain a strictly pseudo-bihermitian structure. The universal cover of the locally conformally para-hyperkähler manifold M is globally conformally para-hyperkähler. The deformation is performed on its para-hyperkähler structure such that H_t is invariant with respect to the fundamental group of M. Then one obtains a generalized pseudo-Kähler structure which after a (global) conformal change descends to a pseudo-bihermitian structure on the quotient. In particular, there are pseudo-bihermitian metrics on properly elliptic surfaces of odd first Betti number and the Inoue surfaces of type S^+ [10]. These surfaces do not admit any (positive) bihermitian structure. On the other hand the quaternionc Hopf surfaces admit both bihermitian and pseudo-bihermitian structures since they have both hyperhermitian and para-hyperhermitian metrics [10]. They also have bihermitian metrics arising from twisted generalized Kähler structures, however it is not clear whether these surfaces admit twisted generalized pseudo-Kähler structures. The same question is open for K3 surfaces too.

Notice that the above constructions of bihermitian and pseudo-bihermitian structures produce "complementary" examples to the surfaces in the lists in Theorem 5. We summarize the examples obtained so far in:

Proposition 8 *Generalized pseudo-Kähler structures exist on complex 2-tori and primary Kodaira surface. Pseudo- bihermitian structures exist also on the quaternionic Hopf surfaces, properly elliptic surfaces with odd first Betti number and Inoue surfaces of type* S^+.

Example 4 Here we provide examples of complex structures J_+ and J_- satisfying the relation $J_+J_- + J_-J_+ = 2pId$ for a nonconstant function p with $|p| > 1$, which are not compatible with any global neutral metric. Consider Example 2 above in the case of a complex torus which is a product of 2 elliptic curves. It admits a holomorphic involution ϕ without fixed points, such that the quotient is a smooth complex surface. This surface is called a hyperelliptic surface of type I_a. One can check that the natural para-hypercomplex structure of the torus descends to a para-hypercomplex structure on the factor, but it admits no compatible para-hyperhermitian metrics [10]. In particular, one can fix a para-hyperkähler family of ϕ-invariant complex structures on the torus and can deform any two structures of this family via the procedure described in Example 2. The Hamiltonian deformations H_t are defined by a single function and if one chooses this function to be ϕ-invariant, then both $(J_+)_t = J_+$ and $(J_-)_t$ are ϕ-invariant for all t. Since they satisfy the relation above for small t, they descend to structures which satisfy the same identity on the quotient hyperelliptic surface. Since $|p| > 1$ at any point for fixed t, $K \neq 0$ everywhere. If there were a compatible metric, then the fundamental forms $F^K + iF^{J_+K}$ obtained as in Example 2 would provide a trivialization of the canonical bundle, which is an absurd because the canonical bundle of a hyperelliptic surface is not topologically trivial.

6 Null-planes of 4-dimensional pseudo-bihermitian metrics

In this section we show that under a mild restriction a naturally defined null-plane distribution on a positive pseudo-bihermitian 4-manifold M determines a local Engel structure. Recall that an Engel structure is by definition a 2-dimensional distribution $\mathcal{D}$ on a 4-manifold M such that $rank[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}] = 3$ and $rank[\mathcal{D}, [\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}]] = 4$ at each point of M. These structures have been actively investigated recently (see the introduction in [28] for an overview). They admit canonical coordinates and are preserved by small $\mathcal{C}^2$-deformations. The global existence of an oriented Engel structure on an oriented compact manifold leads to triviality of its tangent bundle. Moreover, Vogel [28] showed that the converse also holds - any paralellizable 4-manifold admits such a structure.

Let (M, g, J_+, J_-) be a pseudo-bihermitian 4-manifold with $J_+J_- + J_-J_+ = 2pId$. Let $F^{\pm}$ and $\theta_{\pm}$ be the Käher and the Lee form of $(g, J_{\pm})$, respectively. Suppose that the pseudo-bihermitian structure is defined by a (twisted) generalized pseudo-Kähler one. Taking the Hodge-dual 1-forms the condition $d^+F^+ + d^-F^- = 0$ becomes $\theta_+ + \theta_- = 0$.

If we set $K = [J_+, J_-]/2\sqrt{p^2-1}$ as above, then $K^2 = Id$ and $K \neq \pm Id$. Moreover, $g(KX, Y) = -g(X, KY)$, in particular the eigenspaces of K consists of isotropic vectors.

Lemma 9 *For the endomorphism $N_{\pm} = J_+ + (p \pm \sqrt{p^2-1})J_-$ of TM, we have $Ker\, N_{\pm} = Im\, N_{\pm} = \mp$ 1-eigenspace of K.*

Proof: It is easy to see that $N_{\pm}^2 = Id$ and $Ker\, N_+ \cap Ker\, N_- = \{0\}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} -KJ_+ = J_+K &= \frac{p}{\sqrt{p^2-1}}J_+ - \frac{1}{\sqrt{p^2-1}}J_-, \\ -KJ_- = J_-K &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{p^2-1}}J_+ - \frac{p}{\sqrt{p^2-1}}J_-. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that if $\mathcal{K}_{\pm}$ is the $\pm$1-eigenspace of K, then $\mathcal{K}_- \subset Ker\, N_+$ and $\mathcal{K}_+ \subset Ker\, N_-$. Hence $dim\, Ker\, N_{\pm} \geq 2$. This implies the lemma since the kernels of N_+ and N_- are transversal and the dimension of the ambient space is 4. *q. e. d.*

Set $N = N_-$, $f = p - \sqrt{p^2-1}$ and denote the vector field dual to $\theta_\pm$ w.r.t. g by the same letter. For the Levi-Civita connection we have [3]:

$$2(\nabla_X J_\pm)Y = g(X,Y)J_\pm\theta_\pm + g(J_\pm X,Y)\theta_\pm + \theta_\pm(J_\pm Y)X - \theta_\pm(Y)J_\pm X$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\nabla_X N)Y &= g(X,Y)(J_+ - fJ_-)\theta_+ + g((J_+ - fJ_-)X,Y)\theta_+ \\ &+\theta_+((J_+ - fJ_-)Y)X - \theta_+(Y)(J_+ - fJ_-)X + 2X(f)J_-Y \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

since $\theta_- = -\theta_+$. Also $p = -1/2g(J_+,J_-) = 1/4tr(J_+\circ J_-)$ and we get by (5) that

$$dp = \frac{1}{2}\theta_+\circ[J_+,J_-] = \sqrt{p^2-1}\theta_+\circ K. \tag{24}$$

Set $X = (J_+ + fJ_-)\theta_+$ and $Y = \theta_+ + K\theta_-$. Then $X, Y \in Ker\, N$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &g(X,X) = g(Y,Y) = 0, \\ &g(X,Y) = g(X,J_+X) = g(Y,J_+Y) = 0, \\ &g(J_+X,Y) = (f^2-1)|\theta_+|^2 = 2(fp-1)|\theta_+|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Assume that $|\theta_+| \neq 0$. Then X, Y, J_+X, J_+Y is a basis of the tangent space at each point. We have also that

$$\begin{aligned} &g(\theta_+, J_+J_-\theta_+) = g(\theta_+, J_-J_+\theta_+) = -g(J_+\theta_+, J_-\theta_+) = p|\theta_+|^2 \\ &Y = \theta_+ + \frac{J_+J_- - 2p + J_+J_-}{2\sqrt{p^2-1}} = \frac{-f\theta_+ + J_+J_-\theta_+}{\sqrt{p^2-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Now $(\nabla_X N)Y - (\nabla_Y N)X = -N\nabla_X Y + N\nabla_Y X = -N[X,Y]$ since $NX = NY = 0$. To compute $N[X,Y]$ we use the fact that $J_+X = -fJ_-X$, $J_+Y = -fJ_-Y$. Hence by (23) and (25) we have

$$2|\theta_+|^{-2}(\nabla_X N)Y = 2(f^2-1)\theta_+ - 2J_+X = -2f\sqrt{p^2-1}Y$$

since $\theta_+(J_+Y) = g(J_+Y,\theta_+) = 0$ by (26), $\theta_+(Y) = |\theta_+|^2$ and, in view of (24) and Lemma 9, $X(f) = f\theta_+(KX) = f\theta_+(X) = fg(X,\theta_+) = 0$. Similarly

$$2|\theta_+|^{-2}(\nabla_Y N)X = -2(f^2-1)\theta_+ + 2(fp-1)Y - 2fJ_-X$$

$$= 2(fp + f\sqrt{p^2-1} - 1)Y = 0$$

since $\theta_+(X) = 0$, $\theta_+(J_+X) = g(-\theta_+ + fJ_+J_-\theta_+, \theta_+) = -|\theta_+|^2 + fp|\theta_+|^2$ by (26) and $Y(f) = fg(Y, \theta_+) = f|\theta_+|^2$

So $N[X, Y] = f\sqrt{p^2 - 1}|\theta_+|^2 Y$. We can easily check that $NJ_+ + J_+N = 2(pf - 1)Id$. Then $NJ_+Y = 2(pf - 1)Y$ so $[X, Y] \in Span(X, Y, J_+Y)$. Define a distribution on M setting

$$\mathcal{D} = Span(X, Y). \tag{27}$$

It is clear that $rank[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}] = 3$. If $N[Y, J_+Y]$ has a non-zero J_+X-component, then $rank[[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}], \mathcal{D}] = 4$, so $\mathcal{D}$ is an Engel structure. To find the J_+X-component of $N[Y, J_+Y]$ we first observe that $(\nabla_Y N)Y = 0$, so $\nabla_Y Y \in Span\{X, Y\}$. We have also that $2(\nabla_Y J_+)Y = -\theta_+(Y)J_+Y = -|\theta_+|^2 J_+Y$. Since $(\nabla_Y J_+)Y = \nabla_Y J_+Y - J_+\nabla_Y Y$, then $\nabla_Y J_+Y \in Span\{J_+X, J_+Y\}$. Moreover, the J_+X-component of $\nabla_Y J_+Y$ is equal to the X-component of $\nabla_Y Y$. On the other hand we have

$$2(\nabla_{J_+Y} N)Y = -\theta_+(Y)(J_+ - fJ_-)(J_+Y) = 2pf|\theta_+|^2 Y$$

since $(J_+ - fJ_-)J_+Y = J_+(J_+ + fJ_-)Y - 2pfY = -2pfY$. So$N\nabla_{J_+Y}Y = -pf|\theta_+|^2 Y$ and $\nabla_{J_+Y}Y \in Span\{X, Y, J_+Y\}$. Then $[Y, J_+Y] = \nabla_Y J_+Y - \nabla_{J_+Y}Y$ has a nonzero J_+X-component iff $\nabla_Y Y$ has a nonzero X-component. As a result we have:

Theorem 10 *Let (M, g, J_+, J_-) be a (twisted) generalized pseudo-Kähler 4-manifold with non-null Lee forms $\theta_+ = -\theta_-$ and such that $J_+ \neq \pm J_-$ at each point of M. Then either the flow of $Y = \theta_+ + K\theta_-$ consists of null-geodesics, or the distribution $\mathcal{D}$ defined by (27) is an Engel structure on M.*

For the proof, notice that $\nabla_Y Y \in Span\{X, Y\}$ and if its X-component vanishes, $\nabla_Y Y = FY$ which in turn means that the flow of Y is geodesic.

Lets note finally that if $p = const$, the distribution $\mathcal{D}$ is integrable.

References

[1] A. Andrada, S. Salamon, *Complex product structures on Lie algebras*, Forum Math. 17 (2005), no. 2, 261–295.

[2] V.Apostolov, D.Calderbank, P.Gauduchon, C.Tonnesen-Friedmann, *Hamiltonian 2-forms in Khler geometry. IV. Weakly Bochner-flat Khler manifolds*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 16 (2008), no. 1, 91–126.

[3] V.Apostolov, P.Gauduchon, G.Grantcharov, *Bihermitian structures on complex surfaces*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. 79 (1999), no 2, 414-428, *Corrigendum*, 92 (2005), 200 - 202.

[4] V.Apostolov, *Bihermitian surfaces with odd first Betti number*, Math. Z. 238 (2001), no. 3, 555–568.

[5] V.Apostolov, M.Gualtieri, *Generalized Kaehler manifolds, commuting complex structures, and split tangent bundles*, Comm. Math. Phys. 271 (2007), no. 2, 561–575.

[6] W.Barth, K. Hulek, C. Peters and A. Van de Ven, *Compact complex surfaces*, Springer, Heidelberg, Second Edition (2004).

[7] C. Bartocci, E. Macri, *Classification of Poisson surfaces*, Commun. Contemp. Math. 7 (2005), no. 1, 89–95.

[8] F. Bottacin, *Poisson structures on moduli spaces of sheaves over Poisson surfaces*, Invent. Math. 121 (1995), no. 2, 421–436.

[9] J.Davidov, G.Grantcharov, O.Muskarov, M.Yotov, *Parahyperhermitian surfaces*, Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie 52(100) (2009) No 3, 281 - 289.

[10] J.Davidov, G.Grantcharov, O.Muskarov, M.Yotov, work in progress.

[11] M. Dunajsky, S. West, *Anti-self-dual conformal structures in neutral signature*, Recent developments in pseudo-Riemannian geometry, 113–148, ESI Lect. Math. Phys., Eur. Math. Soc., Zurich (2008).

[12] S. Gates, C.Hull, M.Rocek, *Twisted multiplets and new supersymmetric nonlinear sigma models*, Nucl Phys. B248 (1984), 157–196.

[13] M. Goteman, U. Lindstrom *Pseudo-hyperkahler Geometry and Generalized Kahler Geometry* , preprint, arXiv:0903.2376

[14] R. Goto, *Poisson structures and generalized Khler submanifolds*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 61 (2009), no. 1, 107–132.

[15] R. Goto, *Unobstructed K-deformations of generalized complex structures and bihermitian structures* , preprint, arXiv:0911.2958

[16] M. Gualtieri, *Generalized complex geometry*, Oxford University DPhil Thesis, arxiv math.DG/0401221

[17] M. Gualtieri, *Branes on Poisson varieties*, preprint, arXiv:0710.2719

[18] N. Hitchin, *Hypersymplectic quotients*, Acta Acad. Sci. Tauriensis 124 (1990) 169–180, suppl.

[19] N. Hitchin, *Generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds*, Q. J. Math. 54 (2003), no. 3, 281–308.

[20] N. Hitchin, *Instantons, Poisson structures and generalized Kähler geometry* , Commun. Math. Phys. 265 (2006) 131-164.

[21] N. Hitchin, *Bihermitiqan structures on Del Pezzo surfaces*, J. Symplectic Geom. 5 (2007), no. 1, 1–8.

[22] H. Kamada, Neutral hyperkähler structures on primary Kodaira surfaces, *Tsukuba J. Math.* **23** (1999), 321-332.

[23] H. Kamada, *Self-dual Kähler metrics of neutral signature on complex surfaces*, PhD thesis, Tohoku University (2002).

[24] U. Lindstrom, M. Rocek, R. von Unge, M. Zabzine, *Generalized Kahler manifolds and off-shell supersymmetry* , Commun. Math. Phys. 269 (2007) 833-849.

[25] S. Lyakovich, M. Zabzine, *Poisson geometry of sigma models with extended supersymmetry*, Phys.Lett. B 548 (2002), no. 3-4, 243-251.

[26] Y. Matsushita, *Fields of* 2*-planes and two kinds of almost complex structures on compact* 4*-dimensional manifolds*, Math. Z. 207 (1991), no. 2, 281–291.

[27] I. Vaisman, Lectures on the Geometry of Poisson Manifolds, Birkhäuser 1994 (Progress in mathematics, vol. 118).

[28] T. Vogel, *Existence of Engel structures*, Annals of Math. 169 (2009), 79–137.

[29] C.T.C. Wall, *Geometric structures and complex surfaces*, Topology 25 (1986), 119 - 153.

Johann Davidov
Institute of Mathematics and Informatics
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
and
"L. Karavelov" Civil Engineering Higher School
1373 Sofia, Bulgaria
jtd@math.bas.bg,

Oleg Mushkarov
Institute of Mathematics and Informatics
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
muskarov@math.bas.bg

Gueo Grantcharov and Miroslav Yotov
Department of Mathematics
Florida International University
Miami, FL 33199
grantchg@fiu.edu, yotovm@fiu.edu